

# Factorization of integer-valued polynomials with square-free denominator

Giulio Peruginelli

April 30, 2013

*Dedicated to Marco Fontana on the occasion of his 65th birthday*

## Abstract

We compute the essentially different factorizations of a given image primitive integer-valued polynomial  $f(X) = g(X)/d \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ , where  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  and  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  is square-free, assuming that the factorization of  $g(X)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  and  $d$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$  is known. We translate this problem into a combinatorial one.

**Keywords:** Integer-valued polynomial, Factorization, Fixed divisor, Primary components.  
MSC Classification codes: 13B25, 13F20, 13P05.

## 1 Introduction

It is well known that the ring of integer-valued polynomials  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) = \{f \in \mathbb{Q}[X] \mid f(\mathbb{Z}) \subset \mathbb{Z}\}$  is far from being a unique factorization domain. We know that the ring  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is atomic (every non-zero non-unit of  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  admits a factorization into irreducibles) and a bounded factorization domain (each such an element has only finitely many factorizations into irreducibles; see [7]). Moreover, in [3] it is shown that the ring has infinite elasticity, where the elasticity of a domain is defined as the supremum of the set of ratios between lengths of factorizations of non-zero non-units (where the length of a factorization is the number of irreducible elements which appear in the factorization itself).

More recently, in [7] the following result is proved. Given a finite set  $S = \{n_1, \dots, n_r\}$  of positive integers greater than 1, there exists an integer-valued polynomial  $f(X)$  with  $r$  distinct factorizations into irreducibles of length  $n_1, \dots, n_r$ , respectively. Hence, there are elements in the ring of integer-valued polynomials which admit distinct factorizations into irreducibles of arbitrary lengths.

We propose here a new method to establish the essentially different factorizations into irreducibles of a given integer-valued polynomial, under the assumption that the denominator is square-free (we will treat the general case in a future work). We remark that in all

the examples produced in [7] to exhibit polynomials with prescribed sets of lengths, only polynomials with square-free denominator appear (in [7, Thm. 10] there is a polynomial with more than one prime in the denominator, in the previous results there is just one prime factor in the denominator). So, a treatment of this case has a certain interest. We begin by recalling some classical definitions.

The content of a polynomial  $g(X) = \sum_{k=0,\dots,n} a_k X^k \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  is defined as the ideal  $c(g)$  generated by the coefficients  $a_k$  of  $g(X)$ . A polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  is called primitive if its content is equal to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Given  $f \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , we denote by  $d(f)$  the fixed divisor of  $f$ , that is the ideal of  $\mathbb{Z}$  generated by the set  $\{f(n) \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . An integer-valued polynomial  $f(X)$  is said to be image primitive if its fixed divisor is equal to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . By abuse of notation we will identify the principal ideals  $c(f)$  and  $d(f)$  with their non-negative generators. Let  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  be a prime. If  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  we say that  $g(X)$  is  $p$ -primitive if  $p$  does not divide  $c(g)$ , that is, at least one of the coefficient of  $g(X)$  is not divisible by  $p$ . If  $f(X)$  is an integer-valued polynomial, we say that  $f(X)$  is  $p$ -image primitive if  $p$  does not divide  $d(f)$ . Given a polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ , the content of  $g(X)$  is in general a proper divisor of the fixed divisor of  $g(X)$ : consider for example  $g(X) = X(X - 1)$  which is primitive but its fixed divisor is equal to  $2\mathbb{Z}$ . Already in [4] it is shown the important role played by the fixed divisor in the study of the factorizations of an integer-valued polynomial (see the results that we recall below). For example, the polynomial  $g(X) = X^2 + X + 2$ , which is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  (and consequently in  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$  by Gauss Lemma), has fixed divisor equal to  $2\mathbb{Z}$ , so that in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  we have the non trivial factorization  $g(X) = 2 \cdot \frac{g(X)}{2}$ .

We recall the following facts:

- $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ ,  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  and  $\mathbb{Z}$  share the same group of units,  $\{\pm 1\}$  ([3, Lemma 1.1]).
- if  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  is  $p$ -primitive for some prime  $p$  and  $p$  divides the fixed divisor of  $g(X)$ , then  $p \leq d(g)$  (this is due to Polya, see [8, Thm. 3.1] for a modern treatment).
- Let  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  be primitive. Then  $g(X)$  is irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  if and only if it is image primitive and irreducible in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ . Hence, any irreducible factor in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  of an irreducible polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  is a constant and it is a divisor of the fixed divisor of  $g(X)$  (Chapman-McClain [4, Thm. 2.6]).
- Given two integer-valued polynomials  $f$  and  $g$ , we have  $d(fg) \subset d(f)d(g)$  and in general we may not have an equality (see the above example  $X(X - 1)$ ). This is the main difference between fixed divisor and content: in fact, the content of the product of two polynomials  $g_1(X)$  and  $g_2(X)$  is equal to the product of the contents of  $g_1(X)$  and  $g_2(X)$  by Gauss Lemma. This is equivalent to the fact that a polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  is irreducible if and only if it is irreducible in  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$ ; this sentence is no more true if we substitute the ring  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$  with  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  (see the above example  $g(X) = X^2 + X + 2$ ). By the above cited theorem of Chapman-McClain, we have to add the assumption that  $g(X)$  is also image primitive. We notice that a factor of an image primitive polynomial is image primitive ([4]).

Given a polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ , we have  $f(X) = g(X)/d$ , for some uniquely determined  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  and  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $(d, c(g)) = 1$  (we essentially use the fact that  $\mathbb{Z}$  is UFD). For short, we call  $d$  the denominator of  $f(X)$ . We can further express  $f(X)$  in the following way:

$$f(X) = \frac{g(X)}{d} = \frac{\prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)^{e_i}}{\prod_{k \in K} p_k^{e_k}} \quad (1)$$

where  $I = \{1, \dots, n\}$ ,  $K = \{1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $g(X) = \prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)^{e_i}$  is the unique irreducible factorization in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  (the  $g_i(X)$  may be possibly constant) and  $d = \prod_{k \in K} p_k^{f_k}$  is the factorization of  $d$  in  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Obviously,  $f(X)$  is integer-valued if and only if  $d$  divides the fixed divisor of  $g(X)$ , that is, for each  $k = 1, \dots, m$ ,  $p_k^{e_k}$  divides  $d(g)$ . Since  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) \subset \mathbb{Q}[X]$  and  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$  is a UFD, any irreducible factor  $h(X)$  of  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is a rearrangement of the irreducible factors  $g_i(X)$  of  $g(X)$  and the prime factors  $p_k$  of  $d$ , in such a way that we still have an integer-valued polynomial, that is:

$$h(X) = \frac{g_1(X)}{d_1} = \frac{\prod_{i \in J} g_i(X)^{e'_i}}{\prod_{k \in T} p_k^{f'_k}}$$

where  $J \subseteq I$ ,  $T \subseteq K$ ,  $e'_i \leq e_i$ ,  $f'_k \leq f_k$  for each  $i \in J$  and  $k \in T$  and  $h(X)$  is in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , that is  $d_1$  divides  $d(g_1)$ . It is already not clear how a general irreducible polynomial in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  looks like (for polynomials  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  which are irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  see the above Theorem of Chapman-McClain). To our knowledge, the only characterization of such irreducibles is given by [4, Cor. 2.9], which largely relies on the problem of establishing the fixed divisor of a polynomial with integer coefficients. We will give a new characterization of the irreducible elements of  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  in the case of square-free denominator.

As we observed above, being image primitive is a necessary condition for an integer-valued polynomial to be irreducible, so from now on we will consider polynomials  $f \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  which are image primitive and we will give a characterization of such polynomials. In particular, being image primitive implies that the numerator  $g(X)$  is primitive (assuming as before that the denominator  $d$  is coprime with the content of  $g(X)$ ). Notice that the converse of the previous statement does not hold, namely, if an integer-valued  $f(X)$  is image primitive then it is not true in general that  $f(X)$  is irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ . Consider for example  $f(X) = X(X-1)^2/2$  which has the irreducible factor  $X-1$  (by [3, Cor. 2.2 & Example 2.3], monic linear polynomials are irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ ).

Let  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  be a fixed prime. From [9] (but see also [5]) we know that

$$p\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap \mathbb{Z}[X] = \left( p, \prod_{i=0, \dots, p-1} (X-i) \right).$$

where the left-hand side is the ideal of polynomials in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  whose fixed divisor is contained in  $p\mathbb{Z}$ . We denote this ideal by  $I_p$ . We notice that  $I_p = (p, X^p - X)$ , since

$\prod_{i=0,\dots,p-1}(X-i)$  and  $X^p - X$  induce the same polynomial function on  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ . It is easy to see that  $I_p$  has the following primary decomposition (see [9, Lemma 2.2]):

$$I_p = \bigcap_{j=0,\dots,p-1} (p, X-j) \quad (2)$$

where the above intersection is actually equal to a product of ideals, since  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} \doteq (p, X-j)$ , for  $j = 0, \dots, p-1$ , are coprime maximal ideals in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ . More in general, if  $n$  is a positive integer, we set

$$I_{p^n} \doteq p^n \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) \cap \mathbb{Z}[X]$$

which is the ideal of polynomials whose fixed divisor is divisible by  $p^n$ . See [9] for more details and for a complete description of the primary decomposition of this ideal. For the purposes of this article, it is sufficient to know that the primary components of  $I_{p^n}$ , for  $n \leq p$ , are  $\{\mathcal{M}_{p,j}^n\}_{j=0,\dots,p-1}$  ([9]).

Clearly, a polynomial  $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$  like in (1) is in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  if and only if for every prime factor  $p_k$  of the denominator  $d$  we have  $g \in I_{p_k^{e_k}}$ .

In the next section we will introduce the notion of prime covering for a given integer-valued polynomial  $f(X)$ . For each prime  $p$  which appears in the denominator and for each irreducible polynomial  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  which appears in the numerator, we look for the primary components of  $I_p$  which contain  $g(X)$ . A subset of the irreducible factors  $\{g_i(X)\}_{i \in I}$  of the numerator of  $f(X)$  whose elements are contained in all the primary components of  $I_p$  is called a  $p$ -covering. A  $p$ -covering is minimal if, whenever we remove an element, one of the primary components of  $I_p$  is not covered by any of the polynomials left in the  $p$ -covering itself. We show that this notion is related to the property of being irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ . After that we give an algorithm to compute the different factorizations in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  of an image primitive integer-valued polynomial of the form  $f(X) = g(X)/p$ , with  $p$  prime. The choice of a subset  $J \subseteq I$  so that  $\prod_{i \in J} g_i(X)$  is in  $I_p$  corresponds to find a factor of  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ . If that choice is minimal in the sense we said above then that factor is irreducible. In the following section, we generalize to the case of an integer-valued polynomial with square-free denominator. Finally, as an explicit example, we consider the case of an integer-valued polynomial with denominator equal to the product of two distinct primes.

## 2 Prime covering

Let  $f(X) = g(X)/d$  be an integer-valued polynomial, where  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  and  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  are like in (1). Let  $p$  be a prime factor of  $d$ . For each  $i \in I$  we determine the primary components  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j} = (p, X-j)$  of  $I_p$  which contain  $g_i(X)$ . We define thus the following sets:

**Definition 2.1** *Let  $g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  and  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  be a prime. We set*

$$C_{p,g} \doteq \{j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\} \mid g \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}\}.$$

Observe that the set  $C_{p,g}$  can be empty: for instance, take  $g(X) = X^2 + 1$  and  $p = 3$ . Obviously,  $\#C_{p,g} \leq p$ . Notice that

$$g \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j} \Leftrightarrow g(j) \equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

so it is quite easy to determine  $C_{p,g}$ . Equivalently, we consider the polynomial  $\bar{g} \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  obtained by reducing the coefficients of  $g$  modulo  $p$  and we look for the roots of  $\bar{g}(X)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ , in order to find the primary components of  $I_p$  containing  $g(X)$ .

For each irreducible factor  $g_i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  as in (1), we set  $C_i = C_{p,g_i}$ . Obviously, a power of  $g_i(X)$  does not change the primary components of  $I_p$  where the factor lies. Moreover, if we assume  $f(X)$  to be  $p$ -image primitive, there exists  $i \in I$  such that  $e_i = 1$  (otherwise the fixed divisor of  $g(X)$  would be contained in  $p^n\mathbb{Z}$ , for some  $n > 1$ ). For example,

$$f(X) = \frac{X(X-1)^2}{2} = \frac{X(X-1)}{2}(X-1)$$

is image primitive (and it is not irreducible as we say in the introduction). On the contrary,

$$f(X) = \frac{X^2(X-1)^2}{2}$$

is not image primitive. However, the condition on the exponent of the irreducible factors  $g_i(X)$  is not sufficient to ensure that  $f(X)$  is image primitive, as the next example shows:

$$f(X) = \frac{(X^2 + 4)(X^2 + 3)}{2} \tag{3}$$

The polynomial is not image primitive since the numerator has fixed divisor equal to  $4\mathbb{Z}$ . Lemma 2.2 below gives a necessary and sufficient condition for an integer-valued polynomial with a prime  $p$  which exactly divides its denominator to be  $p$ -image primitive.

We have the following result, which involves the family of sets  $\{C_i\}_{i \in I}$  just defined.

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $g(X) = \prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)$  be a product of irreducible polynomials in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  and let  $p$  be a prime. For each  $i \in I$ , let  $C_i = C_{p,g_i}$ . Then*

$$g \in I_p \Leftrightarrow \bigcup_{i \in I} C_i = \{0, \dots, p-1\}$$

**Proof :** Let  $g \in I_p$  and suppose by contradiction that there exists  $k \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  which is not contained in any  $C_i$ , for  $i \in I$ . This means that no irreducible factor  $g_i(X)$  belongs to the primary component  $\mathcal{M}_{p,k}$ , that is  $p$  does not divide  $g_i(k)$ . This implies that  $p$  does not divide  $g(k) = \prod_{i \in I} g_i(k)$ , which is a contradiction.

Conversely, suppose that  $\bigcup_{i \in I} C_i = \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ . This implies that for each primary component  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}$  of  $I_p$  there exists an irreducible factor  $g_i(X)$ , for some  $i \in I$ , contained in  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}$ . Hence, we have that  $g \in \prod_{j=0, \dots, p-1} \mathcal{M}_{p,j} = I_p$ .  $\square$

The next corollary follows immediately from Lemma 2.1, since the condition that  $g(X)$  is  $p$ -image primitive is equivalent to  $g \notin I_p$ .

**Corollary 2.1** *Let  $g(X) = \prod_{i \in I} g_i(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  be as in Lemma 2.1 and let  $p \in \mathbb{Z}$  be prime. Then  $g(X)$  is  $p$ -image primitive if and only if there exists  $j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  such that no  $C_i$  contains  $j$ .*

Obviously we don't need to factor a given integer coefficient polynomial  $g(X)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  in order to establish whether it is  $p$ -image primitive or not, for some prime number  $p$  (just consider it modulo  $p$  and check whether one the  $p$  residue classes in  $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  is not a root). Moreover, by Polya's Theorem we cited in the introduction, it is sufficient to consider only those primes  $p$  which are less or equal to the degree of  $g(X)$ . Anyway, for the study of the problem of the factorization in the ring  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  it is useful to write the statement as it is.

We give now the following definition.

**Definition 2.2** *Let  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_i(X)\}_{i \in I}$  be a set of irreducible polynomials in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ . Let  $p$  be a prime. For each  $i \in I$  we set  $C_i = C_{p, g_i}$ . A  **$p$ -covering** for  $\mathcal{G}$  (or just **prime covering**, if the prime  $p$  is understood) is a subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that*

$$\bigcup_{i \in J} C_i = \{0, \dots, p-1\}.$$

We say that  $J$  is:

- **proper**, if for each  $i \in J$  we have  $C_i \neq \emptyset$ .
- **minimal**, if no proper subset  $J'$  of  $J$  has the same property.

Two  $p$ -covering  $J_1, J_2 \subset I$  for  $\mathcal{G}$  are disjoint if  $J_1 \cap J_2 = \emptyset$ .

Notice that a minimal prime covering is in particular proper and from a prime covering we can always extract a minimal prime covering, by discarding the redundant sets  $C_i$ . We may rephrase Lemma 2.1 by saying that  $f(X) = g(X)/p = \prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)/p$  belongs to  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  if and only if  $I$  contains a  $p$ -covering for  $\{g_i\}_{i \in I}$ . A minimal  $p$ -covering can have 1 element, for example consider the irreducible polynomial  $X^p - X + p$ . It has at most  $p$  elements. The problem to find such  $p$ -coverings has a combinatorial flavour.

The next example shows that given a minimal  $p$ -covering  $J$ , it does not follow that  $\{C_i\}_{i \in J}$  forms a family of disjoint subsets of the residue classes modulo  $p$ . In fact, a single irreducible polynomial  $g_i(X)$  may belong to different primary components of  $I_p$ .

Example:

$$f(X) = \frac{(X^2 - X + 3)(X^2 + 2)}{3} \tag{4}$$

if we set  $g_1(X) = X^2 - X + 3, g_2(X) = X^2 + 2$  we immediately see that

- $C_{3, g_1} = \{0, 1\}, C_{3, g_2} = \{1, 2\}$

- $C_{2,g_1} = \emptyset, C_{2,g_2} = \{0\}$

the second line implies that 2 does not divide the fixed divisor of the numerator, that is  $f(X)$  is 2-image primitive (by one of the remarks we made in the introduction, we check only those primes  $p$  which are less or equal to the degree of  $f(X)$ ). We have that  $C_{3,g_1}$  and  $C_{3,g_2}$  covers the residue classes  $\{0, 1, 2\}$  modulo 3 and they have non trivial intersection. In particular,  $I = \{1, 2\}$  is a minimal 3-covering.

The next lemma characterizes the  $p$ -image primitive integer-valued polynomials, when the denominator is exactly divisible by the prime  $p$ . Moreover the lemma shows that all the minimal  $p$ -coverings must intersect in one spot.

**Lemma 2.2** *Let*

$$f(X) = \frac{\prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)}{d}$$

*be in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ . Let  $p$  be a prime factor of  $d$  such that  $p \parallel d$ . Then  $f(X)$  is  $p$ -image primitive if and only if the following condition holds: there exists a primary component  $\mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}$  of  $I_p$ , for some  $\bar{j} \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ , such that  $g_{\bar{i}} \in \mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}^2$  for some  $\bar{i} \in I$  and for all  $i \in I$ ,  $i \neq \bar{i}$ , we have  $g_i \notin \mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}$ .*

*If that condition holds, then for every minimal  $p$ -covering  $J \subseteq I$ , we have  $\bar{i} \in J$ .*

**Proof :** Suppose  $f(X)$  is  $p$ -image primitive. If for every  $j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  there exist  $i_1(j) \neq i_2(j)$  in  $I$  such that  $g_{i_1}, g_{i_2} \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j}$ , then we can form two disjoint  $p$ -coverings  $J_t = \{i_t(j)\}_{j=0, \dots, p-1}$ , for  $t = 1, 2$ . By Lemma 2.1 the polynomials  $g_{J_1}$  and  $g_{J_2}$  belongs to  $I_p$ , thus their fixed divisor is divisible by  $p$ ; since  $g_I$  is divisible by  $g_{J_1} \cdot g_{J_2}$ , it has fixed divisor divisible by  $p^2$ , contradiction. So there exists  $j' \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  for which only one irreducible factor  $g_{i'}(X)$  is in  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j'}$ . If  $g_{i'} \notin \mathcal{M}_{p,j'}^2$  we are done. Suppose that is not the case. If for all the other  $j$ 's we have either more than one factor  $g_i(X)$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}$  or a factor  $g_i(X)$  which belongs to  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}^2$  we get again to the same contradiction as before. Hence, there must be some  $\bar{j} \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  for which the corresponding primary component  $\mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}$  of  $I_p$  contains one and only one factors  $g_{\bar{i}}(X)$ , which moreover does not belong to  $\mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}^2$ .

Conversely, suppose there exists  $\bar{j} \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  as in the statement. If, for each  $i \in I$ , we set  $C_i = C_{p,g_i}$  we have that  $\bar{j} \notin C_i$  for all  $i \neq \bar{i}$ . Let  $J \subseteq I$  be a minimal  $p$ -covering for  $\{g_i\}_{i \in I}$  (we know that such a prime covering exists since  $f(X)$  is integer-valued,  $p$  divides the denominator of  $f(X)$  and also by Lemma 2.1). Since by definition of  $p$ -covering we have  $\bigcup_{i \in J} C_i = \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ , and for all  $i \in I$ ,  $i \neq \bar{i}$ , we have  $C_i \not\ni \bar{j}$ , then  $\bar{i}$  is contained in  $J$ . Notice that this proves the last statement of the Lemma. So there are no two disjoint  $p$ -coverings. Since  $g_{\bar{i}} \notin \mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}^2$  and  $g_{\bar{i}}$  is the only factor of the numerator of  $f(X)$  in  $\mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}$  we have that  $g_J \notin I_{p^2}$ . Since this holds for every minimal  $p$ -covering  $J$ , this concludes the proof of the Lemma.  $\square$

So, for each prime  $p$  which exactly divides the denominator  $d$  of  $f(X)$ ,  $f(X)$  is  $p$ -image primitive if and only if there exists a primary component  $\mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}$  of  $I_p$  which contains one and only one irreducible factor  $g_{\bar{i}}(X)$  of the numerator of  $f(X)$ . With the notations used in the previous proof, the only  $C_i$  which contains  $\bar{j}$  is  $C_{\bar{i}}$ .

The last statement of Lemma 2.2 cannot be reversed, see for example (3). We have to add the hypothesis that for each minimal  $p$ -covering  $J \subseteq I$  there exists at least one  $i \in J$  such that  $g_i \in \mathcal{M}_{p,j} \setminus \mathcal{M}_{p,j}^2$  for some  $j \in J$ . Equivalently, by the remarks after Definition 2.1, we can say that for at least one residue classes  $j$  modulo  $p$ , there is one and only one irreducible factor  $g_i(X)$  which has a simple root modulo  $p$  in  $j$ .

Notice that, if  $f(X) = g(X)/d$  is in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  and  $p$  is a prime which exactly divides the denominator  $d$  and  $f(X)$  is  $p$ -image primitive, by Lemma 2.2 we cannot have two distinct minimal  $p$ -coverings  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  which are disjoint. Nevertheless, for some  $k \in K$  we can have more than one minimal  $p$ -covering  $J \subseteq I$ , provided they are not disjoint as we have just said. For instance, consider the polynomial:

$$f(X) = \frac{X(X-1)(X-2)}{2 \cdot 3} \quad (5)$$

which is known to be irreducible ([3]). We set  $g_{i+1}(X) = X - i$ , for  $i = 0, 1, 2$ . Then  $J_2 = \{1, 2\}$  and  $J'_2 = \{2, 3\}$  are different minimal 2-coverings, which are not disjoint.

For a fixed prime factor  $p$  of the denominator of  $f(X)$ , there can be more than one minimal  $p$ -covering for  $\mathcal{G}$  even if the polynomial is irreducible. However, any two such prime coverings are not disjoint, as Lemma 2.2 says.

Example 1:

$$f(X) = \frac{X^2 \cdot (X-1) \cdot (X^2+4)}{2}$$

in this example only  $X-1$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}$  and moreover it does not belong to  $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}^2$ . Hence, the polynomial is 2-image primitive.

Example 2:

$$f(X) = \frac{X \cdot (X^2 - 2X + 5) \cdot (X+6)}{2}$$

in this example, only  $g(X) = X^2 - 2X + 5$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}$ . Moreover,  $g \in \mathcal{M}_{2,1}^2$ . No irreducible polynomial in the numerator belongs to  $\mathcal{M}_{2,0}^2$ , but there are two distinct factors, namely  $X$  and  $X+6$ , which belong to  $\mathcal{M}_{2,0}$ . Hence,  $f(X)$  is not 2-image primitive, since the fixed divisor of the numerator is  $4\mathbb{Z}$ . So it is not sufficient to have a unique  $\bar{i} \in I$  such that  $g_{\bar{i}} \in \mathcal{M}_{p,\bar{j}}$ . In general, we also must take care of the exact power of the maximal ideal  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}$  to which each polynomial  $g_i(X)$  belongs to.

## 2.1 Prime denominator

Suppose that an integer-valued polynomial  $f(X)$  is of the form

$$f(X) = \frac{g(X)}{p} = \frac{\prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)}{p} \quad (6)$$

where  $g_i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ , for  $i \in I$ , is irreducible. The fact that  $f \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is image primitive amounts to saying that the fixed divisor  $d(g)$  of  $g(X)$  is exactly equal to the ideal  $p\mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $f \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , by Lemma 2.1 there exists a  $p$ -covering  $J \subseteq I$  for  $\{g_i(X)\}_{i \in I}$ . Next lemma establishes that  $f(X)$  is irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  if and only if  $I$  is a minimal  $p$ -covering. Before doing that, we set some notations. Let  $J \subseteq I$ . We define the following polynomial which is a divisor of  $g(X)$

$$g_J(X) \doteq \prod_{i \in J} g_i(X)$$

and correspondingly we set

$$f_J(X) \doteq \frac{g_J(X)}{p}.$$

**Lemma 2.3** *An image primitive polynomial  $f(X) = g(X)/p$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  as in (6) is irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  if and only if there is no proper subset  $J$  of  $I$  such that  $\bigcup_{j \in J} C_j = \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  (that is,  $I$  is a minimal  $p$ -covering).*

**Proof :** Suppose there exists  $\emptyset \neq J \subsetneq I$  such that  $J$  is a  $p$ -covering. Then

$$f(X) = f_J(X) \cdot g_{I \setminus J}(X)$$

is a non-trivial factorization of  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , because the first factor is integer-valued by Lemma 2.1 and the second one is in  $\mathbb{Z}[X] \subset \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ .

Conversely, if  $f(X)$  is reducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , then there exist non-constant  $g, h \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  such that  $f(X) = h_1(X)h_2(X)$  (because we are assuming  $f(X)$  to be image primitive). Since  $p$  must appear in the denominator of one of the two factors, say  $h_1(X)$ , then for some  $\emptyset \neq J \subsetneq I$  we have  $h_1(X) = g_J(X)/p$  and consequently  $h_2 = g_{I \setminus J} \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ . Since  $h_1 \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , by Lemma 2.1  $J$  is a  $p$ -covering (notice that  $h_1 \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) \Leftrightarrow g_J \in I_p$ ).  $\square$

By Lemma 2.3, if  $f \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is image primitive, then it is irreducible if and only if  $I$  is a minimal  $p$ -covering. Notice that this last equivalence does not hold without assuming  $f(X)$  to be image primitive, as example (3) shows.

By the arguments we have just given, we deduce that every factorization of an image primitive integer-valued polynomial as in (6) is of the form:

$$f(X) = f_J(X) \cdot g_{I \setminus J}(X)$$

where  $J \subseteq I$  is a minimal  $p$ -covering of  $g(X)$ .

Notice that the number of irreducible factors of the previous factorization in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is  $1 + \#(I \setminus J)$ . The assumption that  $f(X)$  is image primitive implies that for each such a minimal  $p$ -covering  $J$ , the set  $I \setminus J$  does not contain a  $p$ -covering.

## 2.2 Square-free denominator

The main problem in the case of more than one prime factor at the denominator of an integer-valued polynomial  $f(X)$ , is that each irreducible factor  $g_i(X)$  of the numerator of  $f(X)$  may belong to different primary components  $\mathcal{M}_{p_k, j}$  of different primes  $p_k$ 's of the denominator. As already remarked in [6], this phenomenon has the effect that if  $p, q$  are two distinct primes, then it does not follow that  $I_p \cdot I_q = I_{pq}$ : for example,  $g(X) = X(X-1)(X-2)$  belongs to  $I_{2,3}$  (see (5)), but it cannot be expressed as a product of a polynomial in  $I_2$  and a polynomial in  $I_3$ . This is due to the fact that the only minimal 3-covering  $J = \{1, 2, 3\}$  is equal to the set  $I$  itself, so in particular it has non-zero intersection with any other of the two possible 2-coverings. Hence, we are lead to give the following definition.

**Definition 2.3** *Let  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_i(X)\}_{i \in I}$  be a set of irreducible polynomials in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  and let  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_k\}_{k \in K}$  be a set of distinct prime integers. A family of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  is a family of sets  $\{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  such that for each  $k \in K$ ,  $J_k \subseteq I$  is a minimal  $p_k$ -covering for  $\mathcal{G}$ .*

Let  $f \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$  like in (1). Lemma 2.1 says that if  $f(X)$  is an integer-valued polynomial, then there exists a family of minimal  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_k\}_{k \in K}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_i(X)\}_{i \in I}$ .

We can now formulate a proposition, which gives a criterion for an integer-valued polynomial to be irreducible, in the case that the denominator is square-free. This is a first step to determine explicitly all the factorization of a given element in the ring  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ .

Firstly we set some notations. Let

$$f(X) = \frac{g(X)}{d} = \frac{\prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)}{\prod_{k \in K} p_k} \quad (7)$$

be a polynomial in  $\mathbb{Q}[X]$ , with  $p_k$  distinct prime integers,  $g_i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ , for  $i \in I$ , irreducible polynomials. Notice that the condition that  $f(X)$  is integer-valued is equivalent to  $g_I(X) = \prod_{i \in I} g_i(X) \in \bigcap_{k \in K} I_{p_k}$ . We set  $\mathcal{G} = \{g_i(X)\}_{i \in I}$  and  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_k\}_{k \in K}$ . As in the previous section, given  $J \subseteq I$  we set  $g_J(X) \doteq \prod_{i \in J} g_i(X)$ . Notice that if  $J_1 \subseteq J_2 \subseteq I$  we have that  $g_{J_1}(X)$  divides  $g_{J_2}(X)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$  (and so in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ ). Similarly, for a subset  $T \subseteq K$  we set

$$d_T \doteq \prod_{k \in T} p_k$$

$(d_K = d)$ . With these notations, a factor of  $f(X)$  is of the form:

$$h(X) = \frac{g_J(X)}{d_T}$$

for some  $J \subseteq I$  and  $T \subseteq K$ .

Finally, if  $T \subseteq K$  and  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  is a family of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$ , we set

$$I_{\mathcal{J},T} \doteq \bigcup_{k \in T} J_k.$$

Notice that, if  $T_1, T_2 \subseteq K$  are two disjoint subsets, then  $I_{\mathcal{J},T_1 \cup T_2} = I_{\mathcal{J},T_1} \cup I_{\mathcal{J},T_2}$ .

**Proposition 2.1** *Let  $f(X)$  be an image primitive integer-valued polynomial with square-free denominator as in (7), with  $\mathcal{P}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  as before. Then  $f(X)$  is irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  if and only if the following holds: for every family  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  we have*

i)  $I = I_{\mathcal{J},K}$ .

ii) there is no non-trivial partition  $K = K_1 \dot{\cup} K_2$  such that  $I_{\mathcal{J},K_1} \cap I_{\mathcal{J},K_2} = \emptyset$ .

Notice that condition i) implies that for each  $i \in I$  there exists  $k \in K$  such that  $C_{p_k, g_i} \neq \emptyset$ , so that each of the  $g_i$ 's belongs to at least one of the primary components  $\mathcal{M}_{p_k, j}$  of some of the ideals  $I_{p_k}$ . Moreover, the family  $\mathcal{J}$  cannot be partitioned, as condition ii) says. If  $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, p_2\}$  then we recover what we have already seen before (see (10)): there exists a family  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_{p_1}, J_{p_2}\}$  of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $I = J_{p_1} \cup J_{p_2}$  and  $J_{p_1} \cap J_{p_2} \neq \emptyset$ . We will treat this case as an example in section 2.3.

**Proof :** Suppose  $f \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  irreducible. Let  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  be a family of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  (it exists because of Lemma 2.1). If  $I$  strictly contains  $I_{\mathcal{J},K}$  then there exists  $t \in I$  which is not contained in any  $J_k$  (equivalently,  $J_k \subseteq I \setminus \{t\}$  for every  $k \in K$ ). This means that  $g_t(X)$  divides  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , because we have

$$f(X) = g_t(X) \cdot \frac{g_{I \setminus \{t\}}(X)}{d}$$

and the second factor is integer-valued, since for each  $k \in K$  we have  $g_{J_k}(X) \in I_{p_k}$  (see Lemma 2.1). Hence, for all such  $k$ 's, we have  $g_{I \setminus \{t\}}(X) \in I_{p_k}$ , since  $J_k \subseteq I \setminus \{t\}$ . This is a contradiction, hence condition i) holds.

If we have a non-trivial partition  $K = K_1 \dot{\cup} K_2$  such that  $I_{\mathcal{J},K_1}$  and  $I_{\mathcal{J},K_2}$  are disjoint, then

$$f(X) = \frac{g_{I_{K_1}}(X)}{d_{K_1}} \cdot \frac{g_{I_{K_2}}(X)}{d_{K_2}}$$

is a non-trivial factorization of  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ , since for every  $k_1 \in K_1$  we have  $g_{J_{k_1}}(X) \in I_{p_{k_1}}$  (again by Lemma 2.1) and  $g_{J_{k_1}}(X)$  divides  $g_{I_{K_1}}(X)$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[X]$ , since  $J_{k_1} \subset I_{K_1}$ . This implies that  $g_{I_{K_1}}(X)/d_{K_1}$  is integer-valued. Similarly, the second factor is integer-valued, too. That would be a non-trivial factorization of  $f(X)$ , which is a contradiction.

Conversely, suppose that for every family  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  conditions i) and ii) hold. Since  $f(X)$  is image primitive, there is no non-unit in  $\mathbb{Z}$  which divides  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ . If  $f(X)$  is reducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  we have  $f(X) = h_1(X)h_2(X)$ , where  $h_1, h_2 \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  are not constant. Since  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z}) \subset \mathbb{Q}[X]$  we have

$$h_i(X) = \frac{g_{I_i}(X)}{d_{K_i}}$$

where, for  $i = 1, 2$ ,  $I_i \subseteq I$  and  $K_i \subseteq K$ . Necessarily we have that  $I_1, I_2$  are disjoint and  $I_1 \cup I_2 = I$ . Similarly,  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are disjoint and  $K_1 \cup K_2 = K$ . Suppose that one of the  $K_i$ , say  $K_2$ , is empty. Then by Lemma 2.1 for each  $k \in K_1 = K$  there exists a minimal  $p_k$ -covering  $J_k \subseteq I_1$ . We set  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$ . By definition, the family  $\mathcal{J}$  is a minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$ . In particular,  $I_{\mathcal{J}, K} \subseteq I_1$ , because each of the  $J_k$ 's is a subset of  $I_1$ . Because of i) we have that  $I = I_K$ , so that  $I_K = I_1$  and consequently  $I_2 = \emptyset$ , since  $I_1$  and  $I_2$  are disjoint. This means that  $h_2(X)$  is a unit.

Suppose now that  $K_i \neq \emptyset$ , for  $i = 1, 2$ . This fact also leads us to a contradiction. In fact, by Lemma 2.1, for each  $i = 1, 2$  and for each  $k_i \in K_i$  there exists a minimal  $p_{k_i}$ -covering  $J_{k_i} \subseteq I_i$ . We set  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$ , which is a family of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$ . In particular,  $I_{\mathcal{J}, K_i} \subseteq I_i$ . By condition i) on  $\mathcal{J}$  we have that

$$I = I_{\mathcal{J}, K} = I_{\mathcal{J}, K_1} \dot{\cup} I_{\mathcal{J}, K_2}.$$

Since  $I_1 \cup I_2 = I$ , we get  $I_{\mathcal{J}, K_i} = I_i$  for  $i = 1, 2$ , which is in contradiction with condition ii).  $\square$

We remark that it is not sufficient that conditions i) and ii) hold only for one family  $\{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings. For instance, let us consider

$$f(X) = \frac{(X-1) \cdot (X-2) \cdot (X-3) \cdot (X-9)}{2 \cdot 3}$$

then if  $g_i(X) = X - i$ , for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $g_4(X) = X - 9$  and  $I = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , we have that

- $J_2 = \{2, 1\}$ ,  $J'_2 = \{2, 3\}$  and  $J''_2 = \{2, 4\}$  are the minimal 2-coverings.
- $J_3 = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $J'_3 = \{1, 2, 4\}$  are the minimal 3-coverings.

we have that  $\mathcal{J} = \{J'_2, J_3\}$  is a family of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  which satisfies both conditions i) and ii) but the polynomial is not irreducible, since  $X - 9$  divides  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ . In fact, the family  $\mathcal{J}' = \{J'_2, J_3\}$  of  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  does not satisfy condition i) of the proposition.

**Corollary 2.2** *Under the assumptions of Proposition 2.1, if there exists a family  $\mathcal{J}$  of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  such that for some  $\bar{k} \in K$  we have  $J_{\bar{k}} = I$ , then the polynomial  $f(X)$  is irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ .*

Notice that the assumption of the corollary implies both conditions i) and ii) of Proposition 2.1 for the family  $\mathcal{J}$ .

**Proof :** Suppose the contrary and let

$$h(X) = \frac{g_{I_1}(X)}{d_{K_1}}$$

be a proper non-trivial factor of  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  such that  $\bar{k} \in K_1 \subsetneq K$ . Notice that  $I_1 \subsetneq I$ , so that in particular  $\bigcup_{i \in I_1} C_{p_{\bar{k}}, i} \subsetneq \{0, \dots, p_{\bar{k}} - 1\}$ , because  $J_{\bar{k}} = I$  is a minimal  $p_{\bar{k}}$ -covering. Let  $\bar{j} \in \{0, \dots, p_{\bar{k}} - 1\} \setminus \bigcup_{i \in I_1} C_{p_{\bar{k}}, i}$ . Then for all  $i \in I_1$  we have that  $p_{\bar{k}}$  does not divide  $g_i(\bar{j})$ . That is in contradiction with  $h \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ .  $\square$

The condition of the previous corollary is not necessary, see (11) below for an example.

Next corollary shows how to factorize an integer-valued polynomial  $f(X)$  as in (7) in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$ . We recall that we are assuming  $f(X)$  to be image primitive (there is no restriction in that) and the denominator of  $f(X)$  to be square-free.

Schematically we are doing the following steps:

- i) For each  $k \in K$  and for each  $i \in I$  we determine the sets  $C_{p_k, g_i}$ .
- ii) Afterwards for each  $k \in K$  we find all the minimal  $p_k$ -coverings  $J_k$ , by grouping together the sets  $C_{p_k, g_i}$ .
- iii) Then for each  $k \in K$  we choose one of the minimal  $p_k$ -coverings we found at point ii) and we define the family  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$ .

**Corollary 2.3** *Let*

$$f(X) = \frac{\prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)}{\prod_{k \in K} p_k} = \frac{g_I(X)}{d_K}$$

*be an image primitive, integer-valued polynomial, where  $p_k$  are distinct prime integers,  $g_i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$  distinct and irreducible.*

*Every factorization of  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is obtained in the following way:*

*let  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_k\}_{k \in K}$  be a family of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings for  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $K$  can be partitioned into  $K = \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} K_i$ , so that the sets  $I_{K_i}$ , for  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ , are disjoint and for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$  the*

integer-valued polynomial  $g_{I_{K_i}}(X)/d_{K_i}$  satisfies the conditions of the previous proposition (so that each of them is irreducible). We set  $I' \doteq \bigcup_{i \in \mathcal{I}} I_i$ . Then

$$f(X) = g_{I \setminus I'}(X) \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \frac{g_{I_i}(X)}{d_{K_i}}$$

is a factorization of  $f(X)$  in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  and every one of them is obtained in that way. Notice that in the previous factorization we have  $\#(I \setminus I') + \#\mathcal{I}$  irreducible factors.

### 2.3 Example: case $d = p_1 \cdot p_2$

Let  $p_1, p_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  be distinct primes. We consider an image primitive integer-valued polynomial of the following form:

$$f(X) = \frac{g(X)}{p_1 p_2} = \frac{\prod_{i \in I} g_i(X)}{p_1 p_2} \quad (8)$$

This amounts to saying that the fixed divisor  $d(g)$  is equal to  $p_1 p_2 \mathbb{Z} = p_1 \mathbb{Z} \cap p_2 \mathbb{Z}$ . By Lemma 2.1, for  $k = 1, 2$ , there exists a  $p_k$ -covering  $J_k$  for  $\{g_i(X)\}_{i \in I}$ . For each  $i \in I$  and for each  $k = 1, 2$  we consider the sets  $C_{p_k, g_i}$  as defined in section 2. With the notation we introduced so far, we can have two different kind of factorization of  $f(X)$ . One possible factorization is:

$$f(X) = \frac{g_{J_1}(X)}{p_1} \cdot \frac{g_{J_2}(X)}{p_2} \cdot \prod_{i \in I \setminus J_1 \cup J_2} g_i(X) \quad (9)$$

for some  $J_1, J_2 \subseteq I$ , where, for  $k = 1, 2$ ,  $g_{J_k}(X)/p_k \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is irreducible. By Lemma 2.3, this corresponds to the fact that, for  $k = 1, 2$ ,  $J_k$  is a minimal  $p_k$ -covering. Obviously,  $J_1$  and  $J_2$  are disjoint.

Another possible factorization is

$$f(X) = \frac{g_J(X)}{p_1 p_2} \cdot \prod_{i \in I \setminus J} g_i(X) \quad (10)$$

for some  $J \subseteq I$ . In this factorization  $g_J(X)/(p_1 p_2) \in \text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is irreducible.

By Lemma 2.1, since  $g_J(X)/(p_1 p_2)$  is integer-valued then for each  $k = 1, 2$ ,  $J$  contains a minimal  $p_k$ -covering  $J_k$ . By Proposition 2.1, the fact that  $g_J(X)/(p_1 p_2)$  is also irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  is equivalent to saying that  $J = J_1 \cup J_2$  (otherwise, we can factor out some  $g_i(X)$  from it) and  $J_1 \cap J_2 \neq \emptyset$  (otherwise we fall in the previous case (9)). It is not true that for some  $k = 1, 2$  we must have  $I = J_k$ , like example (11) below shows.

In [4, Example 3.6] the authors construct an integer-valued polynomial which has two distinct factorizations as in (9) and (10). Now we give two explicit examples: in the first one

only the factorization as in (9) occurs, in the second one we give an irreducible polynomial in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  of the form  $g(X)/(p_1 p_2)$ .

Examples:

$$\begin{aligned} f(X) &= \frac{(X^2 + 12)(X^2 + 2)(X^2 + 10)(X^2 + 16)(X^2 + 4)}{3 \cdot 5} \\ &= \frac{(X^2 + 12)(X^2 + 2)}{3} \cdot \frac{(X^2 + 10)(X^2 + 16)(X^2 + 4)}{5} \end{aligned}$$

the second line is the only factorization in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  that  $f(X)$  can have, since if we put  $g_1(X) = X^2 + 12, g_2(X) = X^2 + 2, g_3(X) = X^2 + 10, g_4(X) = X^2 + 16, g_5(X) = X^2 + 4$  we have:

$$\begin{array}{llllll} C_{3,g_1} = \{0\}, & C_{3,g_2} = \{1, 2\}, & C_{3,g_3} = \emptyset, & C_{3,g_4} = \emptyset, & C_{3,g_5} = \emptyset \\ C_{5,g_1} = \emptyset, & C_{5,g_2} = \emptyset, & C_{5,g_3} = \{0\}, & C_{5,g_4} = \{2, 3\}, & C_{5,g_5} = \{1, 4\} \end{array}$$

so in  $I = \{1, \dots, 5\}$  we only have one 3-covering  $J_3 = \{1, 2\}$  and only one 5-covering  $J_5 = \{3, 4, 5\}$ , and they are disjoint. It is easy to check that 2 and 7 do not divide the fixed divisor of  $g(X)$ , the numerator of  $f(X)$ .

Now we give the second example:

$$f(X) = \frac{X(X^2 + 2)(X^2 + 16)(X^2 + 4)}{3 \cdot 5} \quad (11)$$

so if  $g_1(X) = X, g_2(X) = X^2 + 2, g_3(X) = X^2 + 16, g_4(X) = X^2 + 4$  we have:

$$\begin{array}{llll} C_{3,g_1} = \{0\}, & C_{3,g_2} = \{1, 2\}, & C_{3,g_3} = \emptyset, & C_{3,g_4} = \emptyset \\ C_{5,g_1} = \{0\}, & C_{5,g_2} = \emptyset, & C_{5,g_3} = \{2, 3\}, & C_{5,g_4} = \{1, 4\} \end{array}$$

Then by Proposition 2.1  $f(X)$  is irreducible in  $\text{Int}(\mathbb{Z})$  since  $J_3 = \{1, 2\}$  is the only minimal 3-covering,  $J_5 = \{1, 3, 4\}$  is the only minimal 5-covering,  $I = J_3 \cup J_5$  and  $J_3 \cap J_5 \neq \emptyset$ . Notice that  $J_3 \subsetneq I, J_5 \subsetneq I$ . It is easy to check that 2 and 7 do not divide the fixed divisor of the numerator  $g(X)$  of  $f(X)$ . In particular,  $f(X)$  is image primitive, that is  $d(g) = 3 \cdot 5\mathbb{Z}$ .

As another application of Proposition 2.1 consider the polynomial:

$$f(X) = \frac{X \cdot (X^2 + 1) \cdot (X^2 + X + 1) \cdot (X^2 + 2X + 4)}{2 \cdot 3}$$

and let  $g_1(X) = X, g_2(X) = X^2 + 1, g_3(X) = X^2 + X + 1, g_4(X) = X^2 + 2X + 4$ . Then

-  $J_2 = \{1, 2\}$  is a minimal 2-covering and also  $J'_2 = \{2, 4\}$  is.

- $J_3 = \{1, 3, 4\}$  is a minimal 3-covering and it is the only one.

So  $\mathcal{J} = \{J_2, J_3\}$  is a family of minimal  $\mathcal{P}$ -coverings of  $\mathcal{G}$  such that  $J_2 \subsetneq I$ ,  $J_3 \subsetneq I$ . The same holds for  $\mathcal{J}' = \{J'_2, J_3\}$ . The polynomial is irreducible by Proposition 2.1: if we consider  $\mathcal{J}$  we have  $I = J_2 \cup J_3$  and  $J_2 \cap J_3 \neq \emptyset$ . The same holds for  $\mathcal{J}'$ .

Our method can be easily generalized to the case of denominator divisible by prime powers  $p^n$  such that  $n \leq p$ , since in this case, by the results of [9], the primary components of the ideal  $I_{p^n}$  are just the  $n$ -th power of the maximal ideals  $\mathcal{M}_{p,j}$ , for  $j = 0, \dots, p-1$ . In general, a further study of the primary components of the ideal  $I_{p^n}$  is needed.

## Acknowledgments

The author was supported by the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF), Project Number P23245-N18 and also by INDAM - GNSAGA.

## References

- [1] D. F. Anderson, P.-J. Cahen, S.T. Chapman and W. Smith, *Some factorization properties of the ring of integer-valued polynomials.*, Zero-dimensional commutative rings (Knoxville, TN, 1994), 125-142, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., 171, Dekker, New York, 1995.
- [2] J.-P. Cahen, J.-L. Chabert, *Integer-valued polynomials*, Amer. Math. Soc. Surveys and Monographs, 48, Providence, 1997.
- [3] J.-P. Cahen, J.-L. Chabert, *Elasticity for integral-valued polynomials.*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 103 (1995), no. 3, 303-311.
- [4] S.T. Chapman, B. McClain. *Irreducible polynomials and full elasticity in rings of integer-valued polynomials*, J. Algebra 293 (2005), no. 2, 595-610.
- [5] L. E. Dickson. *Introduction to the theory of numbers*. Chicago 1929.
- [6] D. J. Lewis. *Ideals and Polynomial Functions*, Amer. J. Math. 78 (1956), 71-77.
- [7] S. Frisch. *A construction of integer-valued polynomials with prescribed sets of lengths of factorizations*, to appear in Monatsh. Math..
- [8] W. Narkiewicz. *Polynomial mappings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1600. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995. viii+130 pp. ISBN: 3-540-59435-3.
- [9] G. Peruginelli. *Primary decomposition of the ideal of polynomials whose fixed divisor is divisible by a prime power*. Submitted.